

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHNL030972WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2004/051404	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 05 August 2004 (05.08.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 12 August 2003 (12.08.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.		


1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 10 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the report																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).																

<p style="text-align: center;">The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland</p> <p>Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35</p>	<p>Date of issuance of this report 13 February 2006 (13.02.2006)</p> <p>Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center;">Idhir Britel</div></p> <p>Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60</p>
--	---

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404

International filing date (day/month/year)
05.08.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
12.08.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F13/40

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Albert, J

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7556



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and Industrial
applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
☒ claims Nos. 8-11,13,14,25-28,30-31

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
- ☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☒ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 8-11,13,14,25-28,30-31
- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| the written form | <input type="checkbox"/> has not been furnished |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> does not comply with the standard |
| the computer readable form | <input type="checkbox"/> has not been furnished |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> does not comply with the standard |
- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.
- ☐ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

 International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees.
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
 - ☒ not paid additional fees.
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:
see separate sheet
4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☐ all parts.
 - ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-7,12,15-24,29,32-34

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43b/s.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3-7, 17, 20-24, 34
	No: Claims	1,2,12,15-16,18,19,29,32,33
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	3-7, 20-24
	No: Claims	1,2,12,15-24,29,32-34
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-7,12,15-24,29,32-34
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations
see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051404

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/051404

The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1 : US 5 940 448 A (KUO JAMES R) 17 August 1999

Re Item IV.

1 The separate inventions/groups of inventions are:

claims 1-7, 12, 15-24, 29, 32-34:

The correction circuit comprises a plurality of multiplexers, each multiplexer receiving an input data signal, and a copy of the input data signal, from the communication bus;

- a comparison circuit for comparing the parity signal generated by the parity circuit with a parity signal received from the communication bus, the comparison circuit providing the control signal for controlling the plurality of multiplexers to output either the input data signal or the copy of the input data signal.

claims 8-11, 25-28:

The encoder circuit comprising:

- a plurality of parity circuits, the parity circuits generating a plurality of parity signals from the input data signals;
- means for generating a plurality of control signals using the parity signals, the control signals being used to control the correction circuit;
- wherein a gating circuit is provided in the path between each parity signal and the means for generating the plurality of control signals.

claims 13, 30:

Gating control signal is arranged to block the or each control signal from passing to the correction circuit until all of the input data signals have become stable.

claims 14,31:

Gating control signal is a delayed version of a system clock signal.

2 They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/051404

The features of independent apparatus claim 1 are disclosed in the claimed combination by the document D1 = US 5 940 448 as follows (passages from D1 are cited in parentheses):

A decoder circuit for a communication bus (see e.g. column 1, lines 8-11), the decoder circuit receiving a plurality of data signals from the communication bus (see signals "DP" and "DM" on fig. 4), the data signals being received at different times (see column 1, line 66 - column 2, line 16 and fig. 4), wherein the decoder circuit comprises:

- *a correction circuit for correcting one or more of the input signals (see e.g. "SEO" 60 in fig. 4);*
- *a control signal for controlling the correction circuit (see e.g. g_c in fig. 4);*
- *a gating circuit, the gating circuit arranged in the path of the control signal (see e.g. "AND gate" 60 on fig. 4); and*
- *a gating control signal for controlling the gating circuit such that the control signal for controlling the correction circuit is blocked until a predetermined time (see e.g. output of "delay" block 48 in fig. 4).*

Consequently there is no technical relationship between the above groups of inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features in the sense of Rule 30 EPC.

Re Item V.

- 1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses all features of claim 1 (see Re Item IV, point 2).
- 2 Claim 18 merely comprises the method steps corresponding to the apparatus features of the independent claim 1. Accordingly, also the subject-matter of said independent method claim 18 lacks novelty in view of D1.
- 3 Dependent claims 2, 12, 15-17, 19, 29, 32-34 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2))

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/051404

and (3) PCT). The reasons are the following:

- 3.1 The subject-matter of the claims 2 and 19 is not novel in view of D1. See parity signal g_i and parity circuit 42 on fig. 4.
- 3.2 The subject-matter of the claims 12 and 29 is not novel in view of D1. See fig. 5 and column 4, lines 26-42.
- 3.3 The subject-matter of the claims 15 and 32 is not novel in view of D1. The gating control signal of D1 is generated from the parity bits (see g_c is generated from g_i on fig. 4).
- 3.4 The subject-matter of the claims 16 and 33 is not novel in view of D1. The gating circuit is an AND gate (see gates 30 and 32 on fig. 4).
- 3.5 The subject-matter of the claims 17 and 34 is not involving and inventive step in view of D1. The gating circuit is merely one of several straightforward possibilities from which the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill.
- 4 The combination of the features of dependent claims 3-7, 20-24 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art.

Re Item VII.

- 1 In order to comply with the requirements of Rule 6.3(b)(i) and (ii) PCT, the independent claims should be properly cast in the two-part form using the wording "characterised by", with those features forming part of the prior art being placed in the preamble.
- 2 In order to meet the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the document D1 should be identified in the description of the present application and the relevant prior art therein should be briefly discussed.
- 3 To increase their intelligibility, reference signs should be inserted into all claims in accordance with Rule 6.2(b) PCT.